

An exact renormalization group approach to frustrated magnets

M. Tissier, B. Delamotte and D. Mouhanna

*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Hautes Energies. Universités Paris VI-Pierre et Marie Curie – Paris VII-Denis
Diderot, 2 Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France*

Frustrated magnets are a notorious example where usual perturbative methods fail. Having recourse to an exact renormalization group approach, one gets a coherent picture of the physics of Heisenberg frustrated magnets everywhere between $d = 2$ and $d = 4$: all known perturbative results are recovered in a single framework, their apparent conflict is explained while the description of the phase transition in $d = 3$ is found to be in good agreement with the experimental context.

I. FRUSTRATED MAGNETS

One of the great challenges of present-day condensed matter physics is to understand the effects of competing interactions – frustration – in three-dimensional spin systems. However, after twenty five years of investigations, the question of the nature of the universality class for the phase transition of the simplest frustrated model, the classical antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model on a triangular lattice (AFHT model), is still strongly debated¹. The main feature of this system is that, due to frustration, its ground state is given by a configuration in which the spins have a *non-collinear* order: on an elementary triangular plaquette, they point at 120° one from another. A consequence of this non-collinear order is that, contrary to the case of non-frustrated spin systems, the microscopic order parameter is no longer a single vector but a matrix, built from two *orthonormal* vectors $(\vec{\phi}_1, \vec{\phi}_2)$, playing a role similar to the staggered magnetization in non-frustrated antiferromagnetic systems. This implies a symmetry breaking scheme in which the group of spatial rotation is *fully* broken. In the case of the AFHT model it is given by $O(3) \otimes O(2) \rightarrow O(2)^2$. This situation raises the question of the nature of the phase transition for frustrated magnets in three dimensions. Experiments performed on materials supposed to belong to the AFHT universality class exhibit a critical behavior with exponents differing from those of the standard $O(N)$ universality class³. However the experimental situation calls for several important remarks. First, the critical exponents differ significantly from one material to another and also with those obtained by Monte Carlo simulations performed either directly on the AFHT model or on related models (see ref.[4] for a review). Second, for a given material, the scaling relations are violated at least by two standard deviations. These results are manifestly not compatible with the existence of a true universality.

II. PERTURBATIVE FIELD THEORETICAL CONTEXT

From the theoretical point of view, this state of affairs raises the question of the ability of the field theoretical formalism to explain the experimental and numerical situation. As in the $O(N)$ case, mainly two kinds of approaches have been used to tackle with this problem. We now display the results of these studies.

A. The Non-Linear Sigma Model Approach

The first approach consists in a low-temperature expansion performed around two dimensions on the suitable field theory, the $O(3) \otimes O(2)/O(2)$ Non-Linear Sigma (NL σ) model² which is obtained by expressing the interaction between spins in terms of the Goldstone modes, the excitations associated to the transverse fluctuations of the magnetization. This is realized, as usual, by using the geometrical constraints of the ground state – here the orthonormality of $\vec{\phi}_1$ and $\vec{\phi}_2$ – to get rid of the irrelevant – longitudinal – degrees of freedom. Formally, the resulting partition function writes:

$$Z = \int D\pi \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \int d^d x g_{ij}(\pi) \partial_\mu \pi^i \partial_\mu \pi^j \right] \quad (1)$$

where the π^i 's represent the – three – Goldstone modes of the model, $g_{ij}(\pi)$ encoding their interaction. The expression (1) is then used to evaluate the renormalization of the interaction between the Goldstone modes in a double expansion in the temperature T and in $\epsilon = d - 2$. In the case of frustrated magnets, the result of this study is that there exists, above two dimensions, a stable fixed point². At this fixed point, the symmetry breaking scheme is *enlarged* from $O(3) \otimes O(2)/O(2)$ to $O(3) \otimes O(3)/O(3)$. An important point is that the renormalization group (RG) properties of

a $\text{NL}\sigma$ model depend only on the geometry of the order parameter space – the coset G/H – viewed as a manifold equipped with the metric $g_{ij}(\pi)$ ⁵. In particular, the β functions for the coupling constants entering in the model are given in terms of geometrical quantities on G/H like Ricci – R_{ij} – and Riemann – R_i^{pqr} – tensors on the manifold⁵:

$$\beta_{ij}(g) = \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial l} = \epsilon g_{ij} - \frac{1}{2\pi} R_{ij} - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} R_i^{pqr} R_{jpqr} . \quad (2)$$

This implies that the RG properties depend only on the *local* properties of G/H : the Lie algebras of the symmetry groups of the high and low temperature phases. As a consequence, they are insensitive to its *global* structure – topology – and to the representation used to realized the symmetry breaking scheme. It is known that the manifold $O(3) \otimes O(3)/O(3)$ has the same local structure as $O(4)/O(3)$ on which is built the $\text{NL}\sigma$ model relevant to the four-component *non-frustrated* vector model. As seen from the $\text{NL}\sigma$ model calculations, the two above theories are thus equivalent to all orders. Accordingly, the critical properties of the the AFHT model between two and four dimensions should be governed by the standard $O(4)/O(3)$ universality class². This is however in strong disagreement with both experimental and numerical results as well as the weak-coupling analysis of the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) model of frustrated magnets around four dimensions.

B. LGW model approach

An alternative approach to that of the $\text{NL}\sigma$ model is to consider a suitable LGW representation of the physics of frustrated magnets. This can be obtained, for instance, by relaxing, via a potential, the constraints defining the ground state:

$$Z = \int D\vec{\phi}_1 D\vec{\phi}_2 e^{-\int d^D x \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \vec{\phi}_1^2 + \nabla \vec{\phi}_2^2) + \frac{m^2}{2} (\vec{\phi}_1^2 + \vec{\phi}_2^2) + u (\vec{\phi}_1^2 + \vec{\phi}_2^2)^2 + v (\vec{\phi}_1 \wedge \vec{\phi}_2)^2} \quad (3)$$

The β functions for the couplings u and v are determined in a double expansion in these couplings and in $\epsilon = 4 - d$. The result of this analysis, at dominant order^{6–8}, is that the RG equations obtained have *no* stable fixed point.

C. A critical appraisal

Frustrated magnets thus present a situation in which, contrary to the $O(N)$ case, the different perturbative approaches performed around the lower and upper critical dimensions conflict when naively extrapolated to three dimensions. Since there is no indication that any of these different perturbative results should fail in their respective domain of validity – i.e. for small $\epsilon = d - 2$ and small $\epsilon = 4 - d$ – this situation raises two problems. First, a practical one, which is the determination of the critical behaviour in three dimensions. An high-order double expansion in the coupling constants and in $\epsilon = 4 - d$ or a direct perturbative computation in three dimensions, which are both possible on the LGW model, can, *a priori*, deal with such a question. This depends, however, on the ability to extract reliable predictions out of the asymptotic series obtained, for example, by Borel resummation. But there is no general answer to this question. In fact, it now appears, from several recent studies, that in the case of frustrated magnets the summability of the series is weak, leading to inaccurate or ambiguous results^{9,10}. A second, and more fundamental, problem is the question of the matching between the predictions of the two field theoretical perturbative approaches: how can the existence of a non trivial fixed point around two dimensions be reconciled with the absence of such a fixed point around four dimensions ? Such a problem is, in fact, common to several field theories, relevant for type II superconductors, electroweak-phase transitions, smectic liquid cristal, He_3 , etc. In this sense, the situation observed in the vectorial $O(N)$ model where a non trivial fixed point exists everywhere between two and four dimensions appears to be the exception rather than the rule. Moreover, in the case of frustrated systems one encounters a more striking problem: there is an incompatibility between the symmetries of the $\text{NL}\sigma$ and LGW models. Indeed, as said above, at the fixed point the symmetry of the $\text{NL}\sigma$ model action is enlarged to $O(4)$, a phenomenon that *cannot* occur within the LGW perturbative approach. This raises serious doubts on the perturbative analysis of the LGW model away from $d = 4$. Reciprocally, the *perturbative* analysis of the $\text{NL}\sigma$ model, based on a Goldstone mode expansion, predicts an $O(4)/O(3)$ fixed point, in contradiction with the perturbative LGW results and the experimental and numerical situation in $d = 3$. All this suggests that nonperturbative features could play a major role and thus imposes to go beyond the standard perturbative approaches.

III. EXACT RENORMALIZATION GROUP APPROACH

To clarify this situation we have employed an approach based on the concept of effective average action^{11,12}, $\Gamma_k[\phi]$, which is a coarse grained free energy where only fluctuations with momenta $q \geq k$ have been integrated out. The field ϕ stands here for an average order parameter at the – running – scale k , the analog of a magnetization at this scale. In the limit $k \rightarrow 0$, all modes have been taken into account and Γ_k identifies with the usual effective action Γ . At the scale $k = \Lambda$ – the overall cut-off – no fluctuation has been integrated and Γ_k identifies with the microscopic action. The k -dependence of Γ_k is controlled by an exact evolution equation^{12–14}:

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_k}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left\{ (\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k)^{-1} \frac{\partial R_k}{\partial t} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where $t = \ln k/\Lambda$. The trace has to be understood as a momentum integral as well as a summation over internal indices. In Eq.(4), $\Gamma_k^{(2)}$ is the *exact field-dependent* inverse propagator – i.e. the second derivative of Γ_k – and R_k is the effective infrared cut-off which suppresses the propagation of modes with momenta $q < k$. A convenient cut-off is provided by: $R_k(q) = Z_k q^2 / (\exp(q^2/k^2) - 1)$, where Z_k is the field renormalization. The effective average action Γ_k is a functional invariant under the symmetry group of the system and thus includes all powers of all invariants – and their derivatives – built from the average order parameter. Thus, Eq.(4) is a nonlinear functional equation, too difficult to be solved exactly in general. Therefore Γ_k must be truncated. One – fruitful – possibility, is to perform an expansion of Γ_k around the minimum in order to keep a finite number of monomials in the invariants while including the most relevant derivative terms¹². We have considered the following truncation¹⁵:

$$\Gamma_k = \int d^d x \left\{ \frac{Z_k}{2} \nabla \phi_{ab} \nabla \phi_{ab} + \frac{\omega_k}{4} (\epsilon_{ab} \phi_{ca} \nabla \phi_{cb})^2 + \frac{\lambda_k}{4} \left(\frac{\rho}{2} - \kappa_k \right)^2 + \frac{\mu_k}{4} \tau \right\} \quad (5)$$

where $\{\omega_k, \lambda_k, \kappa_k, \mu_k, Z_k\}$ are the coupling constants that parametrize the evolution of the model with the scale, while $\rho = \text{Tr } {}^t \phi \phi$ and $\tau = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}({}^t \phi \phi)^2 - \frac{1}{4} (\text{Tr } {}^t \phi \phi)^2$ are the two independent $O(N) \otimes O(2)$ invariants built from the average order parameter. Note that, since we have considered the generalization of the initial Heisenberg spin system to N -component spins, the order parameter consists in a real $N \times 2$ matrix ϕ_{ab} . Apart from the “current term” $(\epsilon_{ab} \phi_{ca} \nabla \phi_{cb})^2$ – the terms in (5) are those appearing in the usual LGW action that realizes the symmetry breaking scheme of frustrated magnets. Indeed for λ_k and $\mu_k \geq 0$, the minimum of the action is realized by a configuration of the form $\phi_{ab}^{min} = \sqrt{\kappa_k} R_{ab}$, where R_{ab} is a matrix built with two orthonormal N -component vectors. The symmetry of this minimum is a product of a diagonal $O(2)$ group and a residual $O(N-2)$ group. The symmetry breaking scheme is thus $O(N) \otimes O(2) \rightarrow O(N-2) \otimes O(2)_{diag}$. Note that for $\phi_{ab} = \phi_{ab}^{min}$ one has: $\rho = 2\kappa_k$ and $\tau = 0$ so that Eq.(5) corresponds indeed to a quartic expansion around the minimum. At this minimum, the spectrum of the model, consists in $2N-3$ Goldstone modes and three massive modes: one singlet of mass $m_1 = \kappa_k \lambda_k$ and one doublet of mass $m_2 = \kappa_k \mu_k$ which correspond to fluctuations of the relative angle and of the norms of the two vectors $\vec{\phi}_1$ and $\vec{\phi}_2$. Let us finally stress that, without the current term, the truncation Eq.(5) is however not sufficient in our case. This term plays a crucial role since, for $N=3$, it allows the model to enlarge its symmetry from $O(3) \otimes O(2)$ to $O(3) \otimes O(3) \sim O(4)$ at the fixed point, above $d=2$. The current term is systematically discarded in the perturbative treatment of the LGW model around four dimensions, for the – correct – reason that it is power-counting irrelevant. Here we can include it in our *ansatz* since it is anyway present in the full effective action Γ_k . In fact, we *must* include it since it becomes relevant somewhere between two and four dimensions, the formalism we use being in charge to decide where it is important.

We have derived the flow equations for the different coupling constants $\kappa_k, \lambda_k, \mu_k, \omega_k$ and Z_k using Eq.(4) and Eq.(5)¹⁵. The explicit recursion equations for the dimensionless renormalized coupling constants g_i^r are too lengthy to be displayed here and not particularly illuminating¹⁶. Their general structure is given by:

$$\frac{dg_i^r}{dt} = Dg_i^r + F_i[\{g_j^r\}, \{T_j[m_j^r]\}] \quad (6)$$

where D stand for the dimension – including the anomalous dimension – of the coupling g_i^r . In Eq.(6), the functions F_i involve the whole set of coupling constants $\{g_j^r\}$. More important for our purpose is that the flow equations also involve the whole spectrum – Goldstone as well as massive excitations – of the theory. These masses occur as the arguments of some “threshold” functions $\{T_j\}$ that govern the coupling or decoupling of the massive degrees of freedom. This is precisely this aspect that allows the method to go beyond the pure Goldstone mode expansion performed with the NL σ model around $d=2$.

In practice, we have studied the fixed point structure of the flow equations (6) everywhere between two and four dimensions. Immediately around two dimensions, the fixed point masses m_1^{*r} and m_2^{*r} diverge as $1/\epsilon$. This means a

decoupling of the excitations associated to the fluctuations of the modulus and of the relative angle of $\vec{\phi}_1$ and $\vec{\phi}_2$. The physics is, as expected, fully controlled by the Goldstone modes. The flow equations (6) then degenerate to those of the $O(N) \otimes O(2) \rightarrow O(N-2) \otimes O(2)_{diag}$ NL σ model at one loop. For $N = 3$, they admit a fixed point for which the model is $O(4)$ symmetric, attesting the validity of the perturbative NL σ model approach. However, the flow equations actually admit another – unstable – fixed point, absent in the NL σ model approach, which moves toward the stable one while d is increased. At a critical dimension $d_c \simeq 2.87$, the two fixed points collapse and disappear. Above d_c no other stable fixed point has been found, in agreement with the LGW approach around four dimensions. Note also that we have checked that, around four dimensions, an expansion of our equations in powers of the coupling constants allows to recover exactly the one-loop RG equations found within the LGW approach. The transition in $d = 3$ is thus, rigorously speaking, first order. However, the proximity of d_c with $d = 3$ lets open the possibility of a very weak first order phase transition in this dimension. We have checked that there indeed exists, in $d = 3$, a range of parameters for which the RG flow is very slow. As a consequence the correlation length, although finite, is very large and a pseudo-scaling behaviour – an “almost second order phase transition”¹⁷ – can be observed. Note however that ξ remaining always finite, a true universality should not be expected. This could explain both the observation of a scaling behaviour as well as the existence of a broad spectrum of effective critical exponents in experiments and in numerical simulations. To test this scenario, we have computed effective exponents by linearizing the flow equations around the minimum, taken into account the ϕ^6 -like terms in our *ansatz*. We have checked that the inclusion of monomials of order six in the fields is sufficient to ensure the stability of our results. We have found: $\nu = 0.53$, $\gamma = 1.03$ and $\beta = 0.28$, which lie in between the various sets of exponents found experimentally and numerically. At this stage, one has to mention a work of Pelissetto *et al.* who have studied the $O(N) \otimes O(2) \rightarrow O(N-2) \otimes O(2)_{diag}$ LGW model at six-loop order in fixed dimension $d = 3$ and have reached a somewhat different conclusion¹⁸. From their analysis, they have concluded that there exists a non trivial fixed point in the Heisenberg case. This is in contrast with a previous three-loop calculation in which no fixed point was found^{9,10}. The question is thus that of the stability of the perturbative results with respect to the number of loops or to the Borel resummation procedures. However, amazingly, the exponents found by Pelissetto *et al.* – $\nu = 0.55(3)$, $\gamma = 1.06(5)$ and $\beta = 0.30(2)$ – are very close to our pseudo-exponents, making the question of the existence of a true fixed point somewhat academic. Finally, we have found a true stable fixed point in $d = 3$ for N larger than a critical value $N_c(d = 3) \simeq 5$. For $N = 6$, using ϕ^{10} -like terms, we get $\nu = 0.707$ and $\gamma = 1.377$ that lie in between the error bars of the Monte Carlo data¹⁰ which display a clear second order behaviour with $\nu = 0.700(11)$ and $\gamma = 1.383(36)$. Note that no result has been reported within the six-loop perturbative calculation in this case.

Using an exact renormalization group approach, we have reached a global understanding of the physics of frustrated Heisenberg magnets including a matching between the previous perturbative predictions performed around the upper and lower critical dimensions and a good agreement with experimental and numerical data for the critical physics in $d = 3$.

-
- ¹ H. Kawamura, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **10**, 4707, (1998).
² P. Azaria, B. Delamotte, F. Delduc, and Th. Jolicœur, Nucl. Phys. **B408**, 485, (1993).
³ M.F. Collins and O.A. Petrenko, Can. J. Phys. **75**, 605, 1997.
⁴ D. Loison and K.D. Schotte, Euro. J. Phys. B**14**, 125, (2000).
⁵ D.H. Friedan, Ann Phys. (N.Y.), **163**, 318, (1985).
⁶ D. Bailin, A. Love, and M.A. Moore, J. Phys. C **10**, 1159, (1977).
⁷ T. Garel and P. Pfeuty, J. Phys. C **L9**, 245, (1976).
⁸ M. Yosefin and E. Domany, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 1778, (1985).
⁹ S.A. Antonenko and A.I. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 15901, (1994).
¹⁰ D. Loison, A.I. Sokolov, B. Delamotte, S.A. Antonenko, K.D. Schotte, and H.T. Diep, cond-mat/0001105.
¹¹ C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B352**, 529, (1991).
¹² J. Berges, N. Tetradis and C. Wetterich, hep-ph/0005122.
¹³ C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **301**, 90, (1993).
¹⁴ T.R. Morris, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **9**, 2411, (1994).
¹⁵ M. Tissier, B. Delamotte, and D. Mouhanna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5208, (2000).
¹⁶ M. Tissier, B. Delamotte, and D. Mouhanna, in preparation. Equations available at <http://www.lpthe.jussieu.fr/~tissier>.
¹⁷ G. Zumbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2421, (1993).
¹⁸ A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi and E. Vicari, cond-mat/0007389.